1. Call to Order at 10:06a.m.

- Present: Bill Eadie (Chair), Darlene Yee-Melichar, Mary Ann Creadon, Rob Collins, Catherine Nelson, Chris Mallon, Ken O’Donnell, Judith Lessow-Hurley, Jodie Ullman; Mark Van Selst, Absent: Joe LoCascio, Simone Aloisio;

2. Approval of Agenda

- Agenda approved.
- C. Nelson requested that if members want written liaison reports for inclusion in the minutes, they provide a report to her prior to the meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes (November 2014)

- D. Yee Melichar had the following correction to the November minutes:
  1. 6.4 Student Mental Health Services Advisory – remove DYM from list of members;
- Minutes approved as amended.
- C. Nelson and R. Collins were thanked for their work on the minutes.

4. Pending Business

4.1 Review of Action on Referral from Executive Committee regarding EO 1065. (Bill, Mark, Ken)

- See Ken O’Donnell Liaison Report in 6.1 below.

4.2 Review of Advice to the Chancellor on Handling Consultation with the Community Colleges Regarding Pilot Projects that Result from the Implementation of SB 850 (Community College Baccalaureates). (Catherine, Bill)

Discussion

- B. Eadie referred the committee to the November 2014 minutes for a summary of the conversation to date, particularly item 4.3 for the list of guiding principles the committee drafted. There was a general discussion of the consultation process with the CSU.

Action

- D. Yee Melichar moved to add “period for CCC to reconsider after CSU review” to the list of guiding principles. The point is to provide a period of time for additional intersectional discussion and refinement before degree proposals go to the CCC Board of Governors. With the Yee-Melichar amendment, the committee agreed to finalize its November report as its formal advice to the Executive Committee. (Note: for an update see Chair Filling’s 1/14/15 email to the ASCSU for the latest on the CCC consultation with the CSU)

4.3 Access to Excellence project – Active Learning and Student Success (Darlene).
• D. Yee-Melichar reported on the activities of the AA subcommittee on the A2E strategic plan. She referred the committee to her attachment to the minutes for a brief outline of the report from the subcommittee. The subcommittee is working with Chris Mallon and Ken O’Donnell to get relevant Chancellor’s Office data.

• The committee discussed the nature of “active learning” contained in the “Outcomes and Expected Outcomes for Operational Goal (Commitment) 6: Enhance Student Opportunities for ‘Active Learning’” section of the strategic plan. Comments emphasized the relationship between active learning and high impact practices (HIP), and whether the two are interchangeable. J. Ullman commented that the buzzword is now High Impact Practices (HIP). The report could highlight that active learning has morphed into HIP. If we point out that the concept has become more focused and targeted, it shows growth. D. Yee-Melichar suggested that relevant activities could then be identified. E. Eadie reported that at SDSU the focus is on the broader concept of engagement at all levels of curricular and co-curricular activities in order to integrate the two and strengthen the connection between academic affairs and student affairs. D. Yee-Melichar suggested that The Campus as a Living Lab is another an opportunity to integrate the academic and the facilities/A&F side of the house. M. Creadon remarked that there is a lack of imagination when the CSU talks about innovation. It always means online. That is one among many, but not the leading edge of what we mean by innovative practices.

4.4 Assessment Project - Compare Institutional Learning Outcomes (Jodie).

• J. Ullman indicated that there is nothing new to report. For January the subcommittee wants to narrow the focus to campuses institutional learning outcomes (ILOs); where do they reside? How they are used in the day-to-day life of the campus? How are the outcomes used in the structure of assessment in the CSU (there are different models for how assessment should be done, and how to tie in to ILLs)?

• The committee had a brief discussion of the project, touching upon the availability of ILOs from each campus online, whose perspective is used to do assessment given the various levels of review (faculty and student evaluations, annual program assessment, 5 yr. academic program review, campus and WASC), the relevance of assessment to student learning and the importance of looking at course structure, content, and assignments more critically (and the importance of linkages among these elements of a course). Chico and SFSU were mentioned as good models.

4.5 Ethnic Studies Project – (Catherine, Judith, Rob).

• The nature of this project will be determined following the release of the task force report. The committee will review the report and weigh in where appropriate. Suggestions from the committee for the focus of the AA project include the role ethnic studies plays in the larger CSU curriculum, the relationship between ethnic studies in the curriculum and improvement in campus climate, and how to reduce the gap between taking a course and student success. J. Lessow-Hurley suggested that the chair of AA could call the chair of the task force and inquire about the status of their effort, let them know that we have a prior resolution supporting their work and let them know that we are awaiting their report. Chair Eadie will contact the chair of the taskforce and Loretta Kensinger (Fresno), the ASCSU representative to invite them to give us an update.


Discussion of the project

• M. Van Selst pointed out that the major issue is the purpose of quantitative reasoning in the context of the GE requirement for college graduates, the necessity to have intermediate algebra to meet that need, and alternatives to achieve competency, including statistics. Alternatives
could lead to a dual class degree where principally minority students are not held to the same standard as others. It goes back to high school preparation). If the CSU holds to the intermediate algebra requirement, it often involves remedial work for students, and remedial work acts as screen to keep people out of college. R. Collins suggested that this is a place where minority students are indoctrinated into the lower class of a two-class system. The SFSU conversation in favor of the intermediate algebra requirement is that it allows part of the foundation to make a change among majors, and helps students develop an understanding of how mathematics is integrated into lifelong experience/learning. If a student doesn’t have a foundation of math, what does that say about students the CSU prepares for the 21st century? M. Van Selst commented that the CSU has approved Statway for several community colleges for quantitative reasoning credit. One of the problems with Statway is that if a student takes the Statway course, they are excluded from most STEM sequences. Chair Eadie suggested it would be nice if AA could weigh in on the issue in a way that could get the support of the plenary.

5. Chair’s Report

5.1 Meeting with Edward Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research, regarding potential revisions in the Course Classification System.

- Chair Eadie met with E. Sullivan to determine if there is any interest in the CO in trying to get the course classification system to take into account newer developments in pedagogy. The problem is making sure changes don’t alter “K factors,” i.e., how much weight each teaching unit is given for a particular kind of class. K factors are negotiated through the CBA, so to change K factors would involve contract negotiations. E. Sullivan indicated that the CSU is involved in data collection at this point. He will keep in touch.

5.2 Other

- AA has been contacted by APEP Chair Denise Fleming to ask if AA will collaborate with APEP to do the Senate reception at the January plenary. The committee is amenable if this takes care of our responsibility for a reception for the year.

- Chair Eadie exchanged emails with FGA Chair Tom Krabacher regarding SB 850 (CCC BA degrees). On behalf of the committees, Eadie and Krabacher agreed to share information and collaborate with each other as necessary to work on the implementation of the law.

6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports

6.1. Chancellor’s Office Liaisons

a) Chris Mallon, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development - no report.

b) Ken O’Donnell, Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Policy

Report

- K. O’Donnell reported on the status of changes to EO 1065, the CSU Executive Order dealing with General Education. After additional conversation with the ASCSU in the fall, O’Donnell “got the message” that the position of the body is that “C means C” regarding the minimum grade in the Golden Four (written communication, oral communication, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning and) for both transfer and native CSU students. O’Donnell went back to campus officials, who pretty quickly agreed that a C would work. The latest revision of EO 1065 contained two changes: C- was changed to C in each course in the Golden Four, and more detail was added on how CSU GE Breadth for STEM should work. Eadie will finalize a report to the
Executive Committee regarding the change to a C in each of Golden Four. KD will route 1065 for signature and get a new number for it.

- O’Donnell also reported on Grant funded projects through Irvine Foundation.

1. Michelle Pilati is directing the Linked Learning Pathways to Baccalaureate initiative. The premise is that in high school it is better if pre-professional training and college preparation courses aren’t separated. The CSU proposed the Linked Learning project, suggesting the same approach at California community colleges so that the CSU could recognize professional training courses as transfer credit and for GE certification. Enough liberal learning in the courses would have to be identified to say they qualify for GE designation. The Irvine Foundation gave money for four pilot sites. The work right now is uneven. Two sites are far down the path to integration; the other two are moving much slower. A report from Pilati can be expected in January or March. Two of the pilots are in the health sciences, one in design and engineering, and a one at Pasadena City College embeds GE math inside design and manufacturing courses.

2. The second proposal to the Irvine Foundation is in the works, an e-portfolio students would be able to use at the time of graduation. They could store, display and organize evidence of student learning. The portfolio would be electronic and truly portable. The proposal is based on the premise that there is a bigger advantage when we ask students to archive and narrate evidence of their own learning. They get a metacognitive experience that takes learning to the next level and better equips students to use/continue learning after graduation. Twenty-three career center directors decided to opt into the Portfolium shared platform; the attraction there is that the platform is connected to Linked In. The UC purchased a systemwide license, so the CSU needed to do the same to stay in game. The CSU would help the process by convening a group of faculty and employers to discuss what to put into the portfolio, focusing upon what would convince an employer that a given student is whom they want to hire. Faculty could be told that if they get their students to this finish line, their students would be well positioned for the future.

Discussion

- D. Yee-Melichar asked if the Linked Learning momentum was moving into the CSU. K. O’Donnell responded that he “hadn’t thought of that;” at the CCCs the distinction between career preparation and transfer preparation is pretty stark. “Should this inform the CSU curriculum? Maybe. We offer GE in decontextualized way.”

- J. Ullman asked if in the Portfolium project we are including employers and faculty, would this be push for competency-based learning? K. O’Donnell responded that off the cuff, yes it could. One of the reasons he is interested is to make sure that employers and career centers are talking to each other, and to make sure that faculty are involved. Faculty should be nervous when employers are invited to come look under hood with us. The way he and B. Eadie look at this, employers in the room can help define the end product, but then they should leave the room. From there, faculty look at the best way to get students to finish line. B. Eadie commented that this arrangement is a good tension between, on the one hand, the desire to have employers involved in looking at outcomes (they are doing that anyway in making judgments about quality of students we produce), and on the other hand, our reluctance to turn the curriculum or the process of educating students over to them. Anytime we can improve employers’ perceptions of students, or provide alternative ways of looking at students, we have done good work. There is also a role for students to get sense of what employers might want, so they know what want to put in portfolios. With Portfolium students have control over content and whom it is shared with. We can produce assessments about how students have learned that are accessible to employers, and demonstrate the various ways students learn and produce from the CSU curriculum. J. Lessow-Hurley commented that in the philosophical underpinnings about the
purposes of education, to satisfy an employer is not the only thing we do. And the move to a portfolio in every course in teacher preparation means that all faculty are teaching to the test; teaching becomes mechanistic. Lessow-Hurley also raised questions about how much can you archive, how much access employers will have, what the time frame for the portfolios will be and how to protect privacy. J. Ullman noted that there is data to support the increase in student cognition with portfolios. Ullman also pointed out that portability is a big issue; portfolios are stored virtually at a link, and students can make a pdf. Ullman shares the concern about going into competency education, but on the level of technology the option is okay; students want to keep things to show to potential employers. C. Nelson commented that we should not invite employers into the room to participate in setting standards for what we expect students to learn, and that portfolios for employers should be kept entirely separate from portfolios used in the classroom. D. Yee-Melichar remarked that portfolios are used extensively in programs for evaluation, and research shows that they are useful for student learning. K. O’Donnell commented that there is some foregrounding of employability as one outcome of the degree, but we need a discussion of their appropriate use. R. Collins approved of the scaffolding component of the portfolio where students are encouraged to let employers know what they have learned; but he agrees with the rest of the committee that if businesses are allowed in to dictate what goes on in the classroom, that is a problem.

6.2. Executive Committee Liaison: Praveen Soni

Report

- P. Soni reported on the status of the 120/180 unit degree initiative. The Executive Committee will draft questions to campus senate chairs and senators to get information on what GE outcomes are as a result of changes in program requirements to get to 120/180 units and whether or not shared governance processes followed as degree requirements were changed. The information will be shared with the chancellor. The Executive Committee is asking for a meeting with the chancellor before the January Plenary to discuss the 120/180 conversion issue and changes in the presidential review process to clarify what those changes are. There are reports that faculty/the campus community may not be involved in the review process on at least one campus. J. Lessow-Hurley asked whether there is now a two-year review in addition to the existing five-year review. Chair Filling wants to know when, under the new process for two-year presidential review, campus constituencies get input or information on the results of review. B. Eadie reported that in the presidential review going on at SDSU, there have been multiple calls to the campus community for input, including an email with a link, and specific campus actors were asked for feedback. Soni also reported on searches for the Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning and an Assistant Director of Academic Policy. The search for the latter position has been suspended; possible reconsideration of the position may occur in 2015. The Executive Committee will be in Sacramento in January or February. The ASCSU newsletter will be out next week. The Academic Conference committee will meet the Wednesday of the January Plenary to discuss deliverables from the conference.

Discussion

- D. Yee-Melichar asked if the Executive Committee had a discussion about student success fees or the UC fees situation. Soni responded no. B. Eadie reported some discussion in the Executive Committee about SB 15, the legislation that takes away the autonomy of UC. D. Yee-Melichar commented that if the UC gets what they want, higher tuition, most students will find it difficult to pay, which could in turn impact CSU access.

6.3. Academic Conference Implementation Committee: (Catherine, Darlene)

- D. Yee-Melichar reported that she implemented the CSU Academic Conference 2014 online
evaluation survey with kind assistance from SFSU's Academic Technology staff, especially Nora Scull. The ASCSU Executive Committee did a quick de-brief of the conference, and decided that the conference planning team will have a follow-up meeting on Wednesday, January 21, from 10-11am in the Munitz Room. At that time, the committee will discuss the survey data and breakout session notes with an eye toward next steps.

6.4. Summer Arts Advisory Council - no report.

6.5 CSU Search Committee for Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Research and Partnerships (Darlene)

- D. Yee-Melichar reported that Dr. Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, has announced that Dr. Andrew (Zed) Mason will be joining the Chancellor’s Office as the interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research and Partnerships for one year beginning on December 1, 2014. Dr. Mason has a strong research, publication and fundraising record.

6.6 Other - no additional reports.

7. Member Items/Campus Reports/Potential New Projects

7.1 SFSU's International Education Week (Darlene)

- SFSU's International Education Week spotlights a year-round priority. During International Education Week (IEW) Nov. 17-21, SFSU's IEW celebration was one of the biggest, with culture fairs, music and dance performances, screenings of foreign films, international lunches and dinners, Japanese tea ceremonies, Chinese Culture Day and workshops, seminars and debates on international topics. See: [http://news.sfsu.edu/news/international-education-week-spotlights-year-round-priority](http://news.sfsu.edu/news/international-education-week-spotlights-year-round-priority)

7.2 SFSU's Outstanding Faculty Advisor Award 2014 (Darlene)

- D. Yee-Melichar is happy to report that she received SFSU's Outstanding Faculty Advisor Award 2014 ([http://dos.sfsu.edu/awards](http://dos.sfsu.edu/awards)). The award is special because students nominate and vote for faculty for the award. The committee congratulated Senator Yee-Melichar on her achievement.

7.3 Discussion of Chancellor White’s goals of access, affordability, quality and completion (Darlene)

- D. Yee-Melichar noted that at the Academic Conference, the chancellor placed emphasis on completion as priority and as a framework for the remaining goals of access, affordability and quality. Yee-Melichar commented that access is needed for completion, but the chancellor didn’t talk about affordability and how it affects access. He did talk about quality as the basis for completion. The Senate should weigh in on what we mean by quality. M. Creadon remarked that the A2E subgroup report conclusion could comment that a large part of quality is connected to practices discussed in the report. C. Nelson commented that the chancellor’s comments about online education could affect quality as well. B. Eadie noted the relevance to quality of current Academic Sustainability Taskforce discussions about SUGs and how to distribute state resources among campuses. Eadie noted a comment from the SDSU president to the campus senate that SUGs are important for access but take big chunk out of the budget. D. Yee-Melichar asked Chair Eadie to request an update on the efforts of the Academic Sustainability Taskforce from the Executive Committee.

8. Adjournment at 12:58pm. Respectfully submitted by Catherine Nelson